

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 11-15 and for indicating that claims 4 and 7-10 would be allowable if claims 4 and 7 were rewritten as independent claims reciting the limitations of base claim and any intervening claims. In light this suggestion of the Examiner, claim 1 now includes the limitation of claim 7 and claim 4 includes the limitations of claim 1 (as previously presented).

Claim 1 was objected. This objection should be withdrawn in light of the amendment of claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's position is that it is not apparent as to what particular means execute the steps starting from the limitation "means for operating" in claim 17. In the table below, Applicants provide at least one corresponding structure disclosed in the specification, though there may be more corresponding structures disclosed, that executes the function of each of the means plus function limitations.

Means-plus-function limitation	Corresponding structure
means for operating on the stored sets of points to determine a measured slope for each track in a disc region where roll-off is to be determined;	A feature of "the <i>data processing algorithm</i> used to develop the curvature profile" (see paragraph [0024] of the specification; emphasis added). Please note that different features of a data processing algorithm are means for executing different steps of the data processing algorithm.
means for taking a radial moving average along a plurality of the radial lines on	A "processor" of paragraph [0038] of the specification.

<p>the disc, each radial moving average comprising a radial length sufficient to encompass a plurality of tracks; wherein the radial length is chosen to eliminate spikes from appearing in a differentiation process;</p>	
<p>means for taking a radial derivative along the plurality of the radial lines on the surface of the disc so as to provide the differentiation process;</p>	<p>A feature of “the data processing algorithm used to develop the curvature profile” (see paragraph [0024] of the specification. Please note that different features of a data processing algorithm are means for executing different steps of the data processing algorithm.</p>
<p>means for building a curvature profile from the derivatives along the plurality of the radial lines; and</p>	<p>A feature of “the data processing algorithm used to develop the curvature profile” (see paragraph [0024] of the specification. Please note that different features of a data processing algorithm are means for executing different steps of the data processing algorithm.</p>
<p>means for comparing said curvature profile to a pre-established limit to determine suitability of the disc for use in a disc drive.</p>	<p>A feature of “the data processing algorithm used to develop the curvature profile” (see paragraph [0024] of the specification. Please note that different features of a data processing algorithm are means for executing different steps of the data processing algorithm.</p>

Claims 1-10 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the recitation of the terms “n” and “m” could make these claims indefinite. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to expedite prosecution, the terms “n” and “m” have been removed from the claims.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected as being obvious over Meeks in view of Tian. This rejection should be withdrawn because claim 1 now includes the limitation of claim 7.

Claim 3 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims because “the prior art of record [Meeks and Tian], taken alone or in combination fails to disclose or render obvious in a method for testing a magnetic disc ‘testing is performed on the substrate of a magnetic disc,’ in combination with the rest of the limitations of claims 3, 5, and 6.” Please see page 8, lines 16-18, of the Action of December 22, 2003. Applicants respectfully submit that in light the Examiner’s own prior admission that claim 3 would be allowable over Meeks and Tian, it appears that claim 3 was inadvertently included in the pending Action in the list of claims rejected over Meeks and Tian. Claim 3 has been amended to include the limitation of base claim 1 as previously presented. Claim 3 should be allowable by the Examiner’s own admission.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant's petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **146712009400**.

Dated: September 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Raj S. Davé
Registration No. 42,465

Morrison & Foerster
2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1888
TELEPHONE: (202) 887-1500
FACSIMILE: (202) 887-0763